

April 10, 2006

Subject: Amendment No. 1 to Letter of Interest (LOI) No. REK-6-66265 entitled "USA Trough: Near-Term Component/Subsystem Development"

### **QUESTIONS/ANSWERS**

The following information is provided in response to questions received regarding the subject solicitation:

1. Question: In the text, the statement reads: "Project proposals focused on basic proof of fundamental science and technology concept(s) will be considered outside this scope of work and will not be eligible for evaluation".

With regards to this issue, it is stated in effect in the front section of the LOI that that there is no U.S. supplier of parabolic troughs, and the goal of the LOI is to establish U.S. suppliers.

My company is working on a low cost mirror and support that is not glass. We would need to produce panels using vendors with similar skills that the new design requires. But clearly, there will be some manufacturing development work required.

How do you suggest that the responders balance the fact that, on the one hand, new sources are needed, but on the other hand, we can't propose anything that would require "proof of fundamental science"?

If a company is not now making my proposed design, should I not propose it?

Answer: *Many key components currently only come from other countries (mirrors and receivers for example). NREL's goal is to increase the overall U.S. scope of supply or improve the cost, performance and O&M characteristics of existing components.*

*In terms of a new non-glass mirror, if the proposal can show that the technology is in essence proven in a related application, that it meets the requirements of parabolic trough collectors, and provides a competitive advantage over existing glass mirrors (in cost, performance, reliability, U.S. supply, etc), then it would be appropriate to propose. Field validation of any new component would be an appropriate part of the proposed statement of work. However, a mirror technology that has not been tested outdoors or a modification to something that had been tested outdoors would not be considered as a near-term technology.*

2. Question: We have a novel central line focus concentrator concept that is not a trough. Should we not mention this in an LOI? Is there some sort of future LOI that might support alternative geometries?

Answer: *The focus of this solicitation is to support near-term deployment of plants and increase the U.S. scope of supply. It is NREL's belief that parabolic trough technology has the potential to deploy 1000's of MWs of parabolic trough plants if relative minor cost reductions are achieved. As a result, NREL is generally looking for incremental improvements in the technology, but possibly more radical improvements in the manufacturing processes. This LOI focuses on technologies that would be used in commercial plants during the next 1-5 years. Commercial plants use conventional debt*



*and equity financing, thus any technology used must be perceived as having a low technical risk by the financial community. In general, a technology would need to be similar to existing parabolic trough technology or have a minimum of 5 years of relevant field test experience to be considered low risk by the financial community. Development of new non-trough technologies are not the intention of this solicitation. At this time, it is not known whether future solicitations will be open to alternative geometries or concepts.*

**Offerors are required to acknowledge receipt of this Amendment No. 1, with any proposal submitted in response to this solicitation.**

RECEIPT ACKNOWLEDGED

COMPANY\_\_\_\_\_

NAME AND TITLE\_\_\_\_\_

DATE\_\_\_\_\_

